

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/658,046	09/08/2000	Takayuki Nakajima	450100-02700	2525	
20999 7:	590 09/13/2005		EXAMINER		
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.			HANNETT, JAMES M		
NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2612		
			DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005	DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/658,046	NAKAJIMA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		James M. Hannett	2612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reprivation of the reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutively received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		imely filed ays will be considered timely, the mailing date of this communication, ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🛛	1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 July 2005</u> .						
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
Applicati	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 September 2000</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	A/are: a) accepted or b) objective drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Solution is required if the drawing(s) is consistent of the drawing(s) is consistent and the drawing(s).	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) Notic 3) Infori	t(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Horii does not teach a brightness processing circuit which receives the outputted signals from the means for generating signals and performs brightness processing thereon and a chromatic processing circuit that receives the synthesized signal from the synthesis means and performs color processing thereon.

The examiner disagrees with the applicant and asserts that Horii teaches on Column 9, Lines 10-30 and depicts in Figure 4 the use of a brightness processing circuit (31). Horii clearly teaches that color processing section (31) converts the image data into luminance two-color difference (YUV) data. This process is viewed by the examiner as brightness processing. Furthermore, as depicted in Figure 4 The color processing circuit (31) receives the outputted signals from the image sensor (10) and receives the image data only after processing by (13-15 and 43) therefore, the image processing performed in circuits (13-15 and 43) is viewed by the examiner as means for generating signals. Therefore, the color processing circuit (31) receives image signals generated by a (means for generating signals (13-15 and 43)). Furthermore, Horii teaches on Column 9, Lines 21-29 that after the color processing circuit (31) converts the color signal to a (YUV) signal, the signal is output to encoder (33) which modulates the outputted (YUV) luminance two-color difference signal into a chromatic signal indicative of saturation. Therefore, Encoder (33) is viewed by the examiner as a chromatic processing circuit which receives the synthesized signal (color converted signal) from the synthesis means and performs

Application/Control Number: 09/658,046 Page 3

Art Unit: 2612

color processing thereon. The color processing is viewed by the examiner as the chromatic modulation performed in encoder (33). The Examiner views the synthesis means as the processor circuit (31) which color converts the signal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1: Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,018,363 Horii in view of USPN 6,256,068 Takada et al.
- 2: As for Claim 1, Horii teaches on Column 6, Lines 5-10 the use of an image pickup apparatus comprising: An image pickup element having a color coded filter (10); Column 4, Lines 24-37. Horii teaches that the outputted pixel values are color converted. This process is viewed as a synthesis process. Therefore, Horri teaches synthesis means for generating a synthesis signal based on a signal that is output from the image sensor. Horri teaches on Column 9, Lines 21-25 that the luminance two color difference signals generated from the color conversion circuitry (35) is modulated into a chromatic signal so that the luminance two color difference signal can be output and displayed on a monitor. Therefore, because the encoder (33) performs processing on both luminance data and two color difference data, the encoder is viewed by the examiner as performing both brightness processing and chromatic processing. However, Horii does not teach the use of spatial phase synchronization means for synchronizing horizontal and vertical spatial phases based on output from each line in the image pickup element.

Furthermore, Horii does not teach that the output from the synchronization means is input to the synthesis means.

Page 4

Takada et al teaches on Column 5, Lines 13-57 in the abstract and depicts in Figures (1 and 4) that it is advantageous to output the image data from an image sensor to a horizontal and vertical interpolation circuits that multiply the image data by weight factors. This is viewed by the examiner as spatial phase synchronization means for synchronizing horizontal and vertical spatial phases. Takada et al teaches that it is advantageous to output the image data from an image sensor to a horizontal and vertical interpolation circuits in order to perform interpolation and flicker reduction at the same time. Therefore, improving image quality.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to output the image data from an image sensor of Horri to a horizontal and vertical interpolation circuits that multiply the image data by weight factors as taught by Takada et al in order to perform interpolation and flicker reduction at the same time. Therefore, improving image quality.

- 3: In regards to Claim 2, Horri further depicts in Figure 2 and teaches on Column 12, Lines 6-13 that the color coded filter is a complimentary mosaic coding filter.
- 4: As for Claim 3, Horri further depicts in Figure 2 and teaches on Column 12, Lines 6-13 that the complimentary mosaic color coded filter is based on a repetition of two pixels horizontally by four lines vertically, and Wherein the filter comprises: a first line which is an alternative repetition of Cy (cyan) and Ye (yellow); a second line which is an alternate repetition of G (green) and Mg (magenta); a third line which is an alternate repetition of Cy and Ye; and a fourth line which is an alternate repetition of Mg and G.

Application/Control Number: 09/658,046 Page 5

Art Unit: 2612

5: In regards to Claim 4, Horri further teaches on Column 12, Lines 14-30 that the synthesis means generates new signals S1r, S2r, S1b, and S2b by performing the following operations:

$$S1r = Cy + G$$
, $S2r = Ye + Mg$

$$S1b = Cy + Mg$$
, $S2b = Ye + G$

Based on Cy (cyan), Ye (yellow), G (green), and Mg (magenta) of each pixel data in a signal whose horizontal and vertical spatial phases are synchronized in the spatial phase synchronization means.

- 6: As for Claim 5, Horii further teaches on Column 12, Lines 31-37 that the image pickup element (106) is read on a frame basis by independently scanning odd-numbered and even-numbered lines (interlaced).
- 7: In regards to Claim 6, Claim 6 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 1, since Claim 1 is substantially equivalent to 6.
- 8: As for Claim 7, Claim 7 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 2, since Claim 2 is substantially equivalent to 7.
- 9: In regards to Claim 8, Claim 8 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 3, since Claim 3 is substantially equivalent to 8.
- 10: As for Claim 9, Claim 9 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 4, since Claim 4 is substantially equivalent to 9.
- 11: In regards to Claim 10, Claim 10 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 5, since Claim 5 is substantially equivalent to 10.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 09/658,046

Art Unit: 2612

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James M. Hannett whose telephone number is 571-272-7309. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:00 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James M. Hannett Examiner Art Unit 2612 Page 6

JMH August 25, 2005

THAT RANGER